

## Chapter One

### **Carceral mobilities: A manifesto for mobilities, an agenda for carceral studies**

*Kimberley Peters and Jennifer Turner*

#### **Introduction**

Mobilities research is now an established field of academic enquiry (Faulconbridge and Hui, 2016). In the decade since the publication of two seminal papers that positioned mobilities as ‘centre stage’ in social science research agendas (Sheller and Urry, 2006: 208; Hannam et al., 2006), a proliferation of wide-ranging work on the politics underscoring the movements of people and objects has emerged. As is well-documented elsewhere (Adey et al., 2014; Cresswell and Merriman, 2011), this has ranged from a study of technologies of motion (airplanes, trains, buses, cars and bicycles); to the infrastructures that enable/disable mobility (roads, rails, airports, data centres); the subjects made mobile or immobile by regimes of regulation and control (including commuters, tourists, migrants, military personnel and so on); and the materialities that shape and are shaped by mobilities (food distribution, fossil fuels, passports, and so forth). What ‘mobilities thinking’ has come to achieve, therefore, is a critical consideration a world that is ever ‘on the move’ (Cresswell, 2006). But with the ‘maturity’ (Faulconbridge and Hui, 2016: 8) of the ‘mobilities paradigm’ (Sheller and Urry 2006, 207), how might the study of mobilities *move* forwards? For Faulconbridge and Hui, the future of mobilities research relies on the study of movement – and the politics of movement – remaining ‘vibrant, creative and generative’ (2016: 1). It relies on a recognition that ‘mobilities research is itself on the move’; drawing in new spaces, subjects, events, occurrences and temporalities to examine through a mobilities framework (Falconbridge and Hui, 2016: 1). This movement, we argue, has motioned scholars towards the study of *carceral mobilities*.

At first glance, the words ‘carceral’ and ‘mobilities’ seem to sit uneasily together. Consider the brute physicality of a prison wall. Whether stone, brick, edged with barbed wire or flanked with surveillance, the boundary between the ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ of this particular carceral space also marks an assumed boundary between movement and stasis (Philo, 2014). Outside of these sites is a presumed autonomy of movement, a liberty to move freely. Inside, there is an assumed prohibition of movement, an imposed stasis and inability to move at will. Such a distinction is evident in the conceptual understandings generated in respect of other sites of detention, captivity and holding: the migrant camp, the detention centre, the quarantine island (to name just a few). Unsurprisingly then, where there has been a shift in recent years to take seriously regimes of imprisonment, detention, temporary-holding, and captivity (see Conlon, 2011; Loyd et al., 2012; Martin and Mitchelson, 2009; Moran, 2015; Morin and Moran, 2015; Moran et al, 2013; Pallot, 2005; Turner, 2013, 2016) the study of mobilities have been traditionally ‘overlooked’ (Moran et al., 2012: 446; and also Ong et al., 2014; Philo, 2014). Scholars have, by and large, neglected to ask what a study of movement might offer to understanding environments of relative stasis.

To answer such a question we have to look more carefully to carceral boundaries, and to the concept of *relation* (Adey, 2006). Carceral boundaries – such as prison walls or detention centre fences – mark a further distinction between the visible and invisible which cements the dichotomy between mobility and immobility that has come to define knowledge of carceral systems. Outside is a world that is known. Inside is world few of us will see and which is only visualised and known through media depictions and the imagination (Turner, 2016). These often stark, material boundaries hide the inside, creating an *appearance* of immobility within carceral estates vis-à-vis an *appearance* of hyper-mobility beyond them. Indeed, for Peter Adey, it is relation which is crucial to understanding mobilities. For those embracing a mobile ontology (see Cresswell, 2010), the world is always, wholly ‘on the move’. Stasis, stillness,

fixity are products of a relationship *with* mobility (in other words we can only know that there is immobility when comparing it to mobility). Mobilities rely on anchor points and moorings, binding the two together (Hannam et al., 2006). Moreover though, as Adey contends, mobilities held in relation create ‘illusions of mobility and immobility’ (Adey, 2006: 83). A sleepy village may *appear* to be immobile, unchanging and static. But this is only because of the ‘speed’ of change and movement elsewhere. The sleepy village is, of course, not fixed. Through the passage of time, small, almost unnoticed changes occur. Place is mobile, only at a different pace. Returning to sites of incarceration, here the ‘inside’ appears less mobile than the outside. The ‘outside’ appears is more mobile than the inside. Of course sites of incarceration should not only been understood through the equally problematic dichotomy of inside/outside (rather, as this book shows carceral spaces reach into, beyond, spill-over, muddy and blur any socially and materially constructed boundaries, see also Turner, 2016) but it remains that carceral spaces evoke a visual trickery; an illusion of immobility, where instead spaces of incarceration are often underscored by mobilities. These are mobilities that are simply *different* to those that might ‘normally’ be associated with our understandings of movement and motion (Adey, 2006: 83).

The *illusion* (see Adey, 2006) of carceral space as fixed space limits the possibilities of engaging with such sites as a means of unlocking new knowledge of mobilities. It has led to a neglect in the study of mobilities in relation to carceral life – and to a ‘weakness’ in the study of mobilities as the field has shied away from spaces of apparent fixity (Moran et al., 2012: 446). Yet with mobilities research expressing an explicit focus on the dimensions of *power* embedded in mobile life (including then, of course how power works to immobilise) carceral settings seem to be fertile ground generating fresh insights into questions of how, why, in what ways are people and object able, unable and restricted in their movement. Likewise, mobilities can offer carceral scholars a framework for better understanding the operation of the power

that works to confine, contain, detain, immobilise and also *make mobile* incarcerated peoples. In other words, the question is not whether studies of mobilities have a place in the field of carceral studies and vice versa, but rather: How might examinations of mobilities in carceral settings, and carceral examples of im/mobility help enrich both the study of carceral geographies (see Moran, 2015) and the progression of mobilities research into the next decade? What opportunities, in short, can sites of immobilisation and stasis offer for understanding mobilities and mobile experience, practically and theoretically?

In the introduction to this edited collection we therefore present something of a manifesto for where the mobile field of mobilities studies might move next, alongside an agenda for the future of carceral studies. There is now a wide acknowledgement that '[m]obility is ... a constant practical concern in the management of penal systems (Moran et al., 2012: 449) (see also Gill, 2009; Moran et al., 2013; Mincke and Lemonne, 2014; Mountz, 2011; Philo, 2014). As Alison Mountz and colleagues have noted (2013), no regime of incarceration is without movement. Movement predicates and dictates what it is to be imprisoned, detained or held captive (see Moran et al., 2013; Gill, 2009; Moran et al., 2012; Peters and Turner, 2015). As such, whilst carceral space may not be the most *apparent* lens through which to explore mobilities, mobility is part and parcel of carcerality. This acknowledgement allows us to ask a host of questions pertaining to past and present manifestations of carceral life: How are the movements of persons and objects enabled and restricted within carceral environments such as prisons, detention camps, and asylum centres? Through what means does movement occur between such sites, as people, contraband and ideas are transported between spaces of confinement? In what ways do technologies of incarceration, legal and regulative apparatus, and economic systems impact who and what can move – and where – in/between carceral spaces? How are identities made mobile within carceral regimes, and in what ways do virtual and imaginative capacities shape new possibilities for movement? Ultimately, what systems of

power shape these mobilities and what does this mean for better understanding methods of incarceration, and the politics of mobilities? These are the questions central to this edited collection.

In proposing that studies carceral mobilities might be a means of generating fresh discussion for mobilities scholars and carceral geographers alike, we are not arguing for carceral mobilities to emerge as a tightly bounded sub-field under the banner of ‘mobilities’ but rather as a means of continuing the interdisciplinary project that the mobilities paradigm has so far generated (see Faulconbridge and Hui, 2016). Mobilities has been a project uniquely cross- and trans-disciplinary in scope. A study of carceral mobilities is inspired by this lineage and provides a means of extending this trajectory into the future, weaving together scholars working in the cognate fields of criminology, sociology, international relations and human geography. Drawing on a wide range of perspective and expertise, but sharing – fundamentally – a concern with mobility, this collection seeks to ask how the key tenets of mobilities thinking might be reanalysed in the context of the carceral; and how the carceral can be better understood through an attention to mobilities. Accordingly, this book hopes to offer the potential to radically contribute to studies of mobilities as well as those centred on the politics of incarceration. In what follows we outline this project in greater detail, summarising the contributions this book makes to our understandings of carceral mobilities, before suggesting how such research might extend further in the future.

### **The chapters**

The book to follow attends to the relationship between carcerality (or, we might argue *carceralities*, as we recognise the conditions, qualities and experiences of carceral life to be multiple not singular) and mobilities. It does so through 16 carefully selected chapters, authored by geographers, criminologists, legal scholars, sociologists and practitioners working in (and

with) social policy. These chapters each identify and unpick a range of mobilities that shape (and are shaped by) carceral regimes. They speak to contemporary debates across carceral studies and mobilities research, offering fresh insights to both areas of concern. Importantly, the book moves this discussion internationally – from the Global North to the Global South – providing an examination of carceral mobilities that are themselves not singular but which are couched in a variety of specific, yet networked, spatial contexts (including Australia, the United States, Latin America, France, Britain, Romania and Italy). Moreover, the book is organised in four sections that move the reader through the varying typologies of motion underscoring carceral life: tension, circulation, distribution and transition (see Peters, 2015; and also Cresswell, 2010). Each mobilities-led section seeks to explore the politics encapsulated in specific, yet fluid, regimes of carceral movement. Accordingly, as the field of carceral studies gains momentum (see notably Moran et al., 2013; Moran, 2015; and Morin and Moran, 2015) and the social sciences continue to analyse a world of movement and mobility (see Adey et al., 2014; Faulconbridge and Hui, 2016), *Carceral Mobilities* offers a text of international, interdisciplinary scope which contributes to these topical, timely areas of concern.

The chapters in Part One consider how carceral movements are driven by, and laden with **tensions** – a strain produced between two or more subjects and/or objects. Tension, this section shows, is a force (see Cresswell, 2010) that produces particular mobile outcomes. Specifically the authors each consider the tensions between those who are incarcerated and those who seek to incarcerate them. In Chapter Two Kate Coddington explores how, since the Northern Territory Emergency Response legislation of 2007, Aboriginal Australians in this area have experienced a range of interventions targeting their communities. Meanwhile, hundreds of asylum seekers have experienced mandatory, indefinite detention in the same region, earning it the name ‘Detention Capital of Australia.’ Coddington argues that in spite of the apparent differences in these cases of incarceration, similar mobile, ‘carceral logics’ underscore these

different modes of detention. Crucially for Coddington, these carceral logics are mobile. Regulatory regimes, she posits, move across space and time and this has violent consequences for both Aboriginal Australians and asylum seekers.

Also attending to the ways in which violence is manifest through carceral regimes, in Chapter Three Roberta Altin and Claudio Minca investigate the semi-carceral operations of detention/hospitality centres for asylum seekers, focusing on the carceral regimes that govern the movement of those housed in the centres. Drawing on the case study of the Gradisca Hospitality Centre for Asylum Seekers in the North East of Italy close to the Slovenian border, Altin and Minca examine the rising tensions surrounding supposed ‘unconstrained’ mobilities of those seeking asylum who are permitted into ‘buffer zones’ local to the camp. Here, asylum seekers and migrants alike are seen to create a ‘human excess’, stimulating a prejudice amongst those ‘hosting’ them. Whilst perceived as mobile, such individuals are in fact subject to conditions that create heavily regulated and prescribed mobilities – producing a quasi-carceral experience, for largely non-criminal populations. Whilst there is a tension between perceived ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ and between those who ‘belong’ and ‘do not belong’, Altin and Minca show how asylum seekers also use the mobilities which constrain them to create space for resistance.

Moving back to Australia, Chapter Four turns to youth justice and the tensions between young people and the authorities who seek to govern them through so-called diversionary practices (such as tags, curfews, probation). Elaine Fishwick and Michael Wearing show how such measures, articulated within a landscape of neo-colonialism, are as incarcerating as prison, raising tensions regarding where regimes of carcerality apply (and do not apply). In particular, they demonstrate that diversionary practices for ensuring youth justice within New South Wales hinge on mobilities – the perceived need to govern ‘unruly’ mobilities through the

control of how, where and when young people can and cannot move. Like Altin and Minca they show how the existence of ‘carceral logics’ (to borrow from Coddington) creates ‘liminal’ spaces of semi- or quasi- confinement for those subject to such measures.

To conclude the section, in Chapter Five, Bénédicte Michalon also pays attention to semi-quasi, tension-filled regimes of carcerality via an investigation of the ‘continuum’ of mobilities (borrowing from Gill, 2009) for migrants and asylum seekers in Romania. Here Michalon shows how regimes of so-called ‘tolerance’ create specific modes of mobility that allow neither unrestricted movement nor total confinement. ‘Tolerance’ refers to a very temporary right to remain in Romanian territory, for irregular migrants who are neither legal nor who can be deported. ‘Tolerance’, Michalon reveals, is fraught with tension – allowing irregular migrants the right to move but only under specific, self-regulated conditions.

Following on, Part Two explores considers various forms of **circulation** – physical, material, and imaginative – that operate in carceral space and across the boundary between prison and society (see also Turner, 2016). The authors each explore how carceral life depends upon, is forged and framed by, and is threatened via circulations. As such, these authors urge us to rethink how mobility is perceived and encountered in carceral space. Writing from a perspective of prison sociology, in Chapter Six James Gacek contends that much can be learned from the workings of space and motion in understanding inmates’ identity constructions and their ability to cope with stress within prison. Using qualitative interviews with ten men who have experienced incarceration in Manitoba, Canada, Gacek draws attention to the psychosocial dimensions of spatiality, the important of inner space, and importance of daydreaming for prisoners to ‘escape’ and move beyond their physical existence ‘inside’ prison. Accordingly he explores an imaginative circulation of personhood from inside to outside and back again,



through the power of the mind. He suggests that the use of imagination by inmates is crucial for allowing inmates to adapt to – and move beyond – the carceral structure.

Relatedly, in Chapter Seven Alex Tepperman unpacks the circulation of ideas through the spreading of a ‘convict code’ in early- twentieth century American prisons. His chapter tracks the spread of an anti-institutional ideology common among American inmates from the 1920s to the mid-twentieth century. In addressing the informal movement of inmate culture through the mass movement of prisoners nation-wide, Tepperman uses historiographical methods to explore how such a code and culture was situated amidst dramatic changes to public policy and penal architecture, as well as increasing racial and cultural heterogeneity of state and federal prison communities. Tepperman illustrates how the creation and circulation of the convict code produced meaningful segmental bonding among inmates, which ultimately led to the further mobilisation of the code as it was shared and spread.

Following from this, in Chapter Eight Deirdre Conlon and Nancy Hiemstra further consider the spread of ideas examining how ideologies which link together migrants and criminals – positioning them as ‘one of the same’ – are mobilised, circulated and dispersed. In doing so they demonstrate how this circulation of carceral ideologies has profound impacts for producing exclusions in wider society. Following and tracking policy and media reports, like so many authors in the collection, they demonstrate how resistant practices can challenge mobilities that constrain and limit individuals and collective groups. Indeed, Conlon and Hiemstra argue that ‘counter-mobilisations’ are needed to resist circulations of popular perceptions.

Finally, Anna Schliehe considers more concrete circulations in Chapter Nine; unpacking the significance of objects and their circulation between prison and the home. Drawing on an

object-orientated ontology, Schliehe explores the role of objects in processes of place-making for prison inmates in Scotland. Whilst incarcerated, the ability for inmates to physically move from place-to-place around the prison estate, is often restricted. Where mobility is possible it follows patterns of strict routine, often associated with social hierarchy or status. As Schliehe shows, this pattern of movement and standstill, what is permitted and what is denied, extends to prisoners' possessions. Drawing on findings from qualitative research with young female prisoners in Scotland, Schliehe shows how (drawing on Goffman) objects circulate or 'float' around the prison – passed, hand-to-hand, but notably, also how circulations of personal objects from the home to the prison, allow those incarcerated to gain a sense of self amidst regimes that often strip inmates of their individuality.

Dovetailing the section on circulation, the book next turns to questions of **distribution**, exploring in Part Three how carceral mobilities are produced through distributive mechanisms which create a dispersal of populations, regulations – and ultimately power – in/between the prison and society. In Chapter Ten, Emma Marshall, Patrycja Pinkowska and Nick Gill explore the possibilities of virtual space and social-media technologies for distributing stories of carceral experience, in order to reshape understandings of migrant and asylum seeker experiences. They demonstrate the mobilising capacities of programmes such as Twitter for 'giving voice' to silenced populations, whilst simultaneously drawing out the issues of access to such technologies where use of phones and computers is often severely limited. Focusing on web-based anti-detention campaigns in the UK, the authors argue that the internet opens up the possibility for activism to take new forms creating alternative forms of social and political mobilisation for vulnerable groups.

In Chapter Eleven, Joaquín Villanueva continues to consider distribution as a form or typology of motion, investigating prosecutorial spaces as under-analysed sites in carceral studies. In this

chapter, Villanueva recognises that prosecutorial spaces are crucial sites where decisions are made, which constrain the mobility of individuals elsewhere. In other words, it is prosecutorial spaces that distribute regimes of governance that impact mobility. More so, Villanueva shows how prosecutorial spaces are not fixed in space – but are themselves mobile and distributed. Drawing on the example of the Parisian *banlieue* of Seine-Saint-Denis, Villanueva illustrates the existence of prosecutorial mobility – where courts, chief prosecutors and decisions makers ‘pop up’ and move flexibly across the urban landscape with the intention of mobilising local and regional resources destined to contain or detain individuals located in ‘sensitive’ neighbourhoods. In short, Villanueva argues that this form of mobility has become an important tactic for the exercise of judicial authority.

Katie Maher, in Chapter Twelve, turns attention to the infrastructure of the railroad in colonial and post-colonial Australia and the use of indigenous, criminalised, and incarcerated labour to build and maintain the rail network. Maher demonstrates how power was distributed along the railroad, containing, confining and immobilising those who ironically produced this technology of mobility. Drawing on rich archive records and newspaper cuttings, Maher pieces together a story of mobilities that has in turn distributed and cemented ideas about race, status and belonging. In Chapter Thirteen to follow, Gutiérrez Rivera likewise explores the distribution of power around the Latin American prison in Honduras. Here power does not move from the top-down, in hierarchical structures typical of the prison environment. Rather, guards appoint a small group of inmates known as ‘rondines’, to supervise the rest of the inmates. Whilst still resting on a structure where some inmates may distribute rules, regulations, allowances and so forth, over others, this chapter subverts our understandings of how mobilities work *within* carceral spaces when those mobilities are governed by inmates themselves. Indeed, Gutiérrez Rivera argues that the Honduras prison establishes power relations based on class, which

control and regulate and distribute prison resources in ways atypical to prisons in the Global North.

To conclude, the final section of the book turns to a mobile condition of **transition**. Part Four considers the mobilities realised as persons, things, and ideas *shift* from one space, situation, setting, to another. The authors of this section each consider the experiences of – and politics entwined with – transitions *within* carceral space; and *between* the life ‘inside’ and society ‘outside’. Kirsty Greenwood begins the section in Chapter Fourteen by making a contribution to an emerging knowledge of historical carceral mobilities (see also Morin and Moran 2015). Here, she uncovers a hidden narrative related to the regulation of ‘deviant’ women through the use of semi-penal institutions designed to enable the social mobility of women for their reintegration back into society. This chapter unpicks the bio-political efforts employed to transform deviant women into ‘respectable’ females between 1809 and 1921 in Liverpool, UK. Using the example of Liverpool Female Penitentiary (LFP), Greenwood explores how women were first *removed* from the city, before transitioning back into the city, transformed and rehabilitated. Importantly, Greenwood traces the resistances to these restrictive and idealised regimes and the highly gendered nature of such systematic control.

Next, in Chapter Fifteen, Elizabeth Brown traces how mobility has shaped the history and practices of the juvenile court in the United States. In short, she demonstrates the transition of policies through time which have impacted the mobility of young people via modes of control (for example, curfews), the removal of young people from familial homes, and increased immobilisation through regimes of policing and surveillance. Like Villanueva, Brown challenges the assumption that courts are somehow static points from which decisions are made and measures are laid out. Rather she shows how those decisions and measures shape the mobilities of those implicated in their use. Accordingly, Brown problematises the perception

of the court as an inherent ‘good’, ‘saving’ young people from the ills of urban life, to instead show how progressive directives – adapted over time – perpetuated inequalities and disadvantaged already marginalised and disenfranchised populations.

In Chapter Sixteen, to follow, Avril Maddrell utilises examples from a longitudinal study of a scheme where prisoners on day-release licence ‘do time’ in the form of Community Service in charity shops. Including in-depth interviews with charity shop managers, volunteers, prisoners and prison officers, centring on a male prison in the UK, Maddrell posits the charity shop as a dynamic permeable carceral space, which assists in the transition of licensed prisoners from life in prison, to life back in wider society. Maddrell demonstrates how placements in charity shops contribute to our understanding of the dynamic assemblage of permeable spaces and boundaries that can constitute carceral spaces and practices in the UK and the transitional mobilities associated with the temporal lifecycle of a prison sentence.

Finally, Christophe Mincke concludes the collection by developing the concept of ‘mobilitarian ideology’ (see also Mincke and Lemmone 2014). Here, Mincke presents the need for a wholesale transition in how we think of systems of incarceration. In his chapter, Mincke illustrates the ways in which punitive immobility – a fundamental premise and classical aim of regimes of incarceration – is now shifted on its head, where instead, he argues, mobility is the bedrock of carceral systems. Where immobility has been a concept used to legitimise the function of the prison, now it is mobility that legitimises the existence of penal estates in the twenty-first century. Drawing on the Belgian Prison Act of 2005, Mincke shows how – instead of undermining the prison – a mobilitarian ideology is used as a new ground for its renewed and reversed legitimation where the prison is now presented as mobility-compatible and, even, mobility-based institution.

## **Moving forwards**

With their empirical variety, theoretical diversity, but collective attention to mobilities, the chapters that make up this collection offer mobilities studies an opportunity to assess the ways in which movements are (re)made and (re)produced in sites that have established, concretised and enduring appearances as ones of *relative* stasis. In turn, the chapters offer carceral studies the potential to unlock further the ways in which mobility is ‘centre stage’ (to borrow from Sheller and Urry) in regimes that are foregrounded upon ideologies and mechanisms designed to limit and contain. Such a project, this book demonstrates, is worthwhile. Through the chapters to follow we are able to develop a richer understanding of the *unequal mobilities* that pervade society – both today, and in the past (a key objective for mobilities studies according to Faulconbridge and Hui, 2016). In addition, we can better engage with *mobile futures* (see also Faulconbridge and Hui, 2016), where the future is one that is deniably ‘hyper-carceral’, with the proliferation of prisons, offshore detention centres, migrant camps and so on, as well as the extension of im/mobilising carceral regimes into everyday spaces and places.

However, we would also posit that there is further work to do to expand the contributions of this book and to enhance our understandings of carceral mobilities. These lines of enquiry are sparked by this very book and the provocations it has generated. Further questions remain to be asked, and answered, concerning the spaces, scales, subjects, objects, methods and theories that are part and parcel of carceral and mobile life. In terms of spaces, we might ask if there are still sites, contexts and places where carceral mobilities remain underexplored; for example the prisoner of war camp, which has been thus far marginalised in the sub-field of carceral geography; or rehabilitation centres where regimes are ‘carcerality’ might be self-imposed. We might also attend to a host of everyday spaces (which this book points towards) – the street, the home, the workplace – where carceral conditions and qualities emerge through im/mobilising practices. Applying a mobilities framework to an extended collection of carceral

spaces might then help us to better think through a question that is still plaguing carceral geographers – *what is the carceral?* (Moran, 2016; Turner and Moran, 2015).

Attention to the spaces of carceral mobilities also requires an attention to scale, a key geographic trope for understanding the operation and dissemination of power. This text has drawn attention to the scales across which carceral mobilities operate – from national level regimes that work to confine and immobilise (as seen in the example of the railroad construction in Maher’s chapter) to the local scale of movements within carceral spaces (typified by internal regimes of motion illustrated in the contribution by Gutiérrez Rivera). The book also draws attention to the linkages of scales, as mobilities within bordered spaces, such as the prison (for example, the spread of a code by word of mouth in a single institution) is circulated nationwide, encompassing many prisons. This example might also be interpreted not via a scalar reading, but rather through a flat ontology (Marston et al., 2005) where carceral mobilities might be understood as networked across space. To comprehend how mobilities and carceralities intersect and form and forge one another there is a need to pay attention to scales and networks more seriously. On the one hand – as we have suggested elsewhere (see Peters and Turner, 2015) – this requires us to look to the micro-mobilities (see Bissell, 2010) that shape carceral experiences (for example, the internal motions of the body produced through sickness, the rubbing of restraints against skin, and so forth). There is also a need to look at how global politics is shaping regimes of movement which incarcerate – through ‘buffer zones’ in extra-territorial spaces that hold migrants liminally offshore (see Mountz and Loyd, 2014), to exceptional spaces where terrorists are held, given the suspension and ambiguity of national and international regulations (see Agamben, 2005).

We might also give further thought to the im/mobile subjects that are bound up with carceral regimes. This book presents a range examples: the mobilities and moorings of young people;

those produced through regimes that racially discriminate; the mobilities of those held in temporary ‘hospitality’ camps; those imprisoned; asylum seekers; migrants; and also those whom wider society hopes to ‘reform’. Whilst these chapters do important work in bringing marginalised and vulnerable groups to the forefront of discussion, they still, inadvertently, speak *for* such groups from the top-down perspective of the researcher. More could be done to give voice to the range of persons and groups who are imbricated in regimes that curtail or limit movement. Other individuals remain absent and our attention to aged, gendered and sexed carceral mobilities could be explored further (see Rosenberg and Oswin in respect of the latter, 2015). Moreover – whilst much work focuses on the disciplined and coerced mobilities of those incarceration, more could be done to shed light on the mobilities of those *doing* the incarcerating: prison guards, asylum centre workers, transport services whom move prisoners and so on. This book touches on this through examples of the mobilities central to judicial and prosecutorial roles (see Brown and Villanueva) but there remains space to better understand carceral mobilities from a fuller range of subject-centred perspectives.

Furthermore, whilst this book has pointed towards the politics of mobility in relation to objects (which are often regulated and restricted in carceral spaces, see Schliehe) much more attention to movements of objects in carceral spaces can assist in understanding regimes of security and surveillance in the prison (shedding light on contraband, and its ability to slip past and through technologies designed to prevent boundary penetration). How are drones, for example, utilised to infiltrate the prison and deliver restricted objects? Moreover, how are mobilities within carceral spaces such as the prison shaped by competition over material resources? And how does access to ‘things’ and ‘stuff’ depend on evidence of appropriate disciplined mobilities which in turn earn specific rights and privileges? There is also a greater need to focus on ‘big’ things (see Jacobs, 2006) and consider the materiality of architecture for shaping carceral regimes (see Moran et al., forthcoming). The role of architecture as part and parcel of carceral



mobilities is oddly absent in this collection. Following from this, we might also question how movement is permitted through virtual means for those who are incarcerated (as Marshall et al. describe in this volume). As the example of ‘Prison Cloud’ – a secure internet platform for inmates, currently being trialled in Europe – demonstrates, there are might be novel ways of investigating how movement is made possible in carceral environments, as well as highlighting the tensions in such allowances for those who have had everyday liberties legally curtailed.

Finally, we might consider further, the methods and theories used to conduct research into carceral mobilities. At the start of this chapter we noted that the terms ‘carceral’ and ‘mobilities’ appear to sit in opposition to one another. Although carceral spaces present only an illusion of stasis, it remains a brute fact – as this collection shows – that carceral spaces are filled with restrictions and limitations, curtailments and exceptions. These same constraints impact the access of researchers to carceral spaces in this first instance (see Altin and Minca’s chapter). This is an issue not only associated with studies of carceral movement, rather it is one that impacts the study of carceral space per se. Whilst there are spatial differences in access (demonstrated in this book, where access to prisons in the Global North rely on different permissions to those in the Global South, for example) researchers must themselves abide to rules and regimes that govern their own movement once within such sites. Such limits are, in many cases, necessary to protect vulnerable people, and researchers. Yet the capacity of research to provide understanding, give voice to unheard populations and to even evoke change, demonstrates the need for continued ‘carceral’ work. We might ask therefore, how might we actually research carceral mobilities more effectively. Is there a place for mobile methods in researching the mobilities of carceral populations and places? (See Büscher and Urry, 2009). And following on, what theories might we employ to make sense of such movements in carceral space? Returning again to the start of this chapter, we noted that carceral mobilities offered yet another opportunity to extend the interdisciplinary project of mobilities

studies – and arguably – carceral studies. A study of *carceral* mobilities may provide the opportunity to use tools of analysis from disciplines ranging of criminology to legal studies, which bring new frameworks of understandings for making sense of im/mobilities in a host of carceral settings. In turn, a mobile ontology may allow those working in a range of fields from social policy to history, to enhance their examinations of carceral processes and practices. We therefore close this introduction by opening up lines of enquiry that build from this book, which carceral scholars, mobilities scholars, geographers, criminologists, sociologists and historians may wish to address *together*.

## References

Adey P (2006) If mobility is everything then it is nothing: Towards a relational politics of (im) mobilities. *Mobilities* 1(1): 75–94.

Adey P, Bissell D, Hannam K, Merriman P and Sheller M (eds) (2014) *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Agamben G (2005) *State of Exception*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bissell D (2010) Vibrating materialities: Mobility–body–technology relations. *Area* 42(4): 479–486.

Büscher M and Urry J (2009) Mobile methods and the empirical. *European Journal of Social Theory* 12(1): 99–116.

Conlon D (2011) Waiting: Feminist perspectives on the spacings/timings of migrant (im)mobility. *Gender, Place and Culture* 18 (3): 353–360.

Cresswell T (2006) *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Cresswell T (2010) Towards a politics of mobility. *Environment and planning D: Society and Space* 28(1): 17–31.

Cresswell T and Merriman P (2011) *Geographies of Mobilities: Practices, Spaces, Subjects*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Faulconbridge J and Hui A (2016) Traces of a mobile field: Ten years of mobilities research. *Mobilities* 11(1): 1–14.

Gill N (2009) Governmental mobility: The power effects of the movement of detained asylum seekers around Britain's detention estate. *Political Geography* 28(3): 186–196.

Hannam K, Sheller M and Urry J (2006) Editorial: Mobilities, immobilities and moorings. *Mobilities* 1(1): 1–22

Jacobs JM (2006). A geography of big things. *Cultural Geographies* 13(1): 1–27.

Loyd JM, Mitchelson ML and Burrige A (2012) *Beyond Walls and Cages: Prisons, Borders, and Global Crisis*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Marston AA, Jones JP and Woodward K (2005) Human geography without scale. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30(4): 416–432.

Martin LL and Mitchelson ML (2009) Geographies of detention and imprisonment: Interrogating spatial practices of confinement, discipline, law, and state power. *Geography Compass* 3(1): 459–477.

Mincke C and Lemonne A (2014) Prison and (im) mobility. What about Foucault? *Mobilities* 9(4): 528–549.

Moran D (2015) *Carceral Geography: Spaces and Practices of Incarceration*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Moran D (2016) Conceptualising the carceral in carceral geography. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Geographers, San Francisco, CA.

Moran D, Gill N and Conlon D (eds) (2013) *Carceral Spaces: Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Moran D, Piacentini L and Pallot J (2012) Disciplined mobility and carceral geography: Prisoner transport in Russia. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37(3): 446–460.

Moran D, Turner J and Jewkes Y (forthcoming) Becoming big things: Building events and the architectural geographies of incarceration in England and Wales. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*.

Morin KM and Moran D (eds) (2015). *Historical Geographies of Prisons: Unlocking the Usable Carceral Past*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Mountz A (2011) Where asylum-seekers wait: Feminist counter-topographies of sites between states. *Gender Place and Culture* 18(3): 381–399.

Mountz A, Coddington K, Catania RT and Lloyd JM (2013) Conceptualizing detention. Mobility, containment, bordering, and exclusion. *Progress in Human Geography* 37(4): 522–541.

Mountz A and Loyd J (2014) Transnational productions of remoteness: Building onshore and offshore carceral regimes across borders. *Geographica Helvetica* 69(5): 389–398.

Ong CE, Minca C and Felder M (2014) Disciplined mobility and the emotional subject in Royal Dutch Lloyd's early twentieth century passenger shipping network. *Antipode* 46(5): 1323–1345.

Rosenberg R and Oswin N (2015) Trans embodiment in carceral space: Hypermasculinity and the US prison industrial complex. *Gender, Place and Culture* 22(9): 1269–1286.

Pallot J (2005) Russia's penal peripheries: Space, place and penalty in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30(1): 98–112.

Peters K (2015) Drifting: Towards mobilities at sea. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 40(2): 262–272.

Peters K and Turner J (2015) Between crime and colony: Interrogating (im)mobilities aboard the convict ship. *Social and Cultural Geography* 16(7): 844–862.

Philo C (2014). ‘One must eliminate the effects of... diffuse circulation [and] their unstable and dangerous coagulation’: Foucault and beyond the stopping of mobilities. *Mobilities* 9(4): 493–511.

Sheller M and Urry J (2006) The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A* 38(2): 207–226.

Turner J (2013) Disciplinary engagements with prisons, prisoners and the penal system. *Geography Compass* 7(1): 35–45.

Turner J (2016) *The Prison Boundary: Between Society and Carceral Space*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Turner J and Moran D (2015) Carceral Geographies VII: Future Directions in Carceral Geographies panel session at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Geographers, Chicago, IL.